



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,824	06/14/2006	Diane Dromgold	RNCC-001	8730
50986 7590 10/18/2011 LAW OFFICE OF DAVID H. JUDSON 15950 DALLAS PARKWAY SUITE 225 DALLAS, TX 75248				
EXAMINER SWARTZ, STEPHEN S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3623				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/18/2011		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mail@davidjudson.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/582,824

**Applicant(s)**

DROMGOLD, DIANE

**Examiner**

STEPHEN S. SWARTZ

**Art Unit**

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14-16, 18-20, 23, 24 and 33-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14-16, 18-20, 23, 24, and 33-36 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-SB08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This **Final Office Action** is responsive to applicant's amendment filed on 18 July 2011. Applicants amendment on 18 July 2011. Currently Claims 14-16, 18-20, 23-24, and 33-36 are pending and have been examined. The examiner notes that no amended claims have been filed with the presented arguments.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments 18 July 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. The applicant argues on page 2 that Miller does not disclose "a display of people and their tasks and interrelationships with other people and their tasks".

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments the examiner for further clarification points to Figure 3, Figure 6, col. 7, lines (58-60) and col. 8, lines (20-23) of Miller teaches a display combination of tasks for a person as well as all tasks. Figure 3 specifically discloses an information that is displayed with respect to a person and all the tasks that they are responsible, as well as all of the people. This information will include what a person is directly responsible for as well as a part of, not directly responsible, and shared responsibility tasks. This would indicate that the interrelationship between the tasks and people are known.

4. The applicant argues on page 3 that Miller does not disclose “human-centric data in a single display view such that each human resource is visually linked with tasks, timing and dependency data in a one-to-many relationship” and that “the previously cited area people-centric way of looking at the task is not illustrated, nor explained in any detail”.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments the examiner for further clarification the examiner points back to col. 11, lines (47-55) of Miller describes that the invention can also be viewed including all of the task information, people, timing and how it's all linked in a people-centric fashion. It is also noted that in Figure 3, the fishbone graph indicated a person based on the bolding of the line directly or not directly responsible for. Furthermore in Figure 5 indicates an example of peoples responsibilities.

5. The applicant argues on page 4 that Miller does not disclose “human resource-centric data in a single display view such that each human resource is visually linked with tasks, timing, and dependency data in a one-to-many relationship”.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments the examiner for further clarification the examiner points to Figure 1, Figure 1a displays fishbone graph that indicates bold line shows a user directly involved in task. This indication of not only the connection between different subtasks, but also the ability to show what a person is directly and not directly responsible for shows a human centric, one-to-many-relationship.

6. The applicant argues on page 4 that Miller does not disclose “task centric and human resource centric and providing a switch between any two such graphical representations”.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments the examiner for further clarification the examiner points to Figure 1 and Figure 1a of Miller. In Figure 1 discloses a fishbone graph that displays all of the tasks and subtasks with the boldness of the line indicating the responsibility of a person (directly or not directly responsibility) which is people-centric, figure 1a also discloses a key for the fishbone diagram in figure 1. Figure 1a then discloses a Gantt chart that has tasks and timing. These two graphs can be moved back and forth for different details indicating different “switching” displays.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 14-16, 18-20, 23, 24, and 33-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller (U.S. Patent 6,101,481).

**Referring to Claim 14**, Miller teaches an apparatus for facilitating the computer-based management of a project, having a series of tasks, comprising:

**a processor** (see; col. 2, lines (15-19) and col. 10, line (64) - col. 11, line (8) of Miller teaches a computer that is used to process project management details).

**a data store for storing a project management dataset, the project management dataset including task data, human resource data, timing data and dependency data** (see; col. 1, lines (62) – col. 2, line (60) of Miller teaches a computer that stores and utilizes data with regards to project management, the associated tasks, people resources, timing, and the dependencies).

**a task-based project management application executed by the processor and which is arranged to access the data store, and to allow the graphical display and manipulation of the dataset in a task-centric manner, in which said application graphically displays the associated data for each task** (see; col. 6, lines (26-32), col. 11, lines (44-55), col. 12, lines (11-13), and (35-42) of Miller teaches a tasked based project management application that can graphically display the task assignments and allow manipulation of the information).

**a resource-based project management application executed by the processor and which is arranged to access the data store, and which groups for each human resource a corresponding task, timing and dependency data in a human resource-centric manner, so each human resource is linked with associated task and timing data in a one-to-many relationship**, (see; col. 6, lines (26-32), col. 11, lines (44-55), col. 12, lines (11-13), and (35-42) of Miller teaches not only a tasked based project management application that can graphically display the task assignments and allow manipulation of the information, but also the ability to switch to a people-centric view that shows the link between the person and the tasks that need to be performed along with timing).

**a graphical representation component for graphically representing said executed by the processor to graphically represent the human resource-centric data in a single display view such that each human resource is visually linked with tasks, timing and dependency data in a one- to-many relationship** (see; col. 6, lines (26-32), col. 11, lines (44-67), col. 12, lines (11-13) and lines (35-42) of ).

**Referring to Claim 15**, Miller teaches an apparatus for facilitating the computer based processor to graphically represent the human. Claim 15 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 14, Claim 15 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 14, except for the following noted exceptions.

**a graphical representation component executed by the processor to generate a graphical representation of either the first or second data stores** (see; col. 6, lines (26-32) and col. 12, lines (43-51) of Miller teaches a graphical display of the project management that was pulled from multiple data sets).

**a switching application for switching executed by the processor to switch between graphical representations of the task-centric or human resource-centric views** (see; col. 6, lines (26-32) and col. 11, lines (44-67) of Miller teaches graphical representation of the project management function and the ability to view tasks and people with alternate viewing means (i.e. switch between representations).

**Referring to Claim 16**, Miller teaches an apparatus for facilitating the computer based management of a project having a series of tasks. Claim 16 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 14, Claim 16 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 14.

**Referring to Claim 18**, Miller teaches an apparatus for facilitating the computer based management of multiple projects, each project having a series of tasks. Claim 18 recites the

same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 14, Claim 18 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 14.

**Referring to Claim 19**, see discussion of claim 18 above, while Miller teaches the apparatus above, Miller further discloses an apparatus having the limitations of:

**further including a display on which the single display view is rendered to facilitate management of the multiple projects** (see; col. 4, lines (25-29), col. 9, lines (4-9), col. 12, lines (35-42), and col. 13, lines (29-38) of Miller teaches a project management program that can graphically display multiple projects in a single view).

**Referring to Claim 20**, see discussion of claim 14 above, while Miller teaches the apparatus above, Miller further discloses an apparatus having the limitations of:

**further including a link inserter executed by the processor to enable dependency-based links to be inserted between dependent tasks or events associated with the human resources** (see; col. 13, lines (29-38) of Miller teaches the ability of the project management program to allow a user to modify dependencies and tasks associated with the people).

**Referring to Claim 23**, Miller teaches a computer readable medium containing program code, the program code being operative to instruct a programmable processor to execute a human resource-based management application. Claim 23 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 14, Claim 23 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 14, except for the following noted exception.



**the dependency data for at least one human resource pointing to at least one other human resource whose task, timing and dependent data for the project is also visually presented in the single display view** (see; col. 13, lines (29-38) of Miller teaches the ability of the project management program to allow a user to modify dependencies and tasks associated with the people and then display it for viewing in a display).

**Referring to Claim 24**, Miller teaches a computer readable medium containing program code, the program code being operative to instruct a programmable processor to execute a human resource-based management application. Claim 24 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 14, Claim 24 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 14, except for the following noted exception.

**the dependency data for at least one human resource pointing to at least one other human resource whose task, timing and dependent data for the project is also visually presented in the single display view** (see; col. 13, lines (29-38) of Miller teaches the ability of the project management program to allow a user to modify dependencies and tasks associated with the people and then display it for viewing in a display).

**Referring to Claim 33**, see discussion of claim 14 above, while Miller teaches the computer readable medium above, Miller further discloses a computer readable medium having the limitations of:

**wherein the timing data for at least one human resource visually incorporates at least a keyword associated with the task data** (see; col. 5, lines (34-36) of Miller teaches the importance of the wording of tasks).

**Referring to Claim 34**, see discussion of claim 23 above, while Miller teaches the computer readable medium above, Miller further discloses a computer readable medium having the limitations of:

**wherein the human resource-based project management application is operative to instruct the programmable processor to capture a modification to one of: task, timing and dependency data associated with a first human resource, and, in response, adjusting one of: task, timing and dependency data associated with a second human resource** (see; Figure 12 of Miller teaches a flow chart that shows the process of modification to task dependency with regards to people and adjusting the resource).

**Referring to Claim 35**, see discussion of claim 34 above, while Miller teaches the computer readable medium above, Miller further discloses a computer readable medium having the limitations of:

**wherein the human resource-based project management application is operative to instruct the programmable processor to update the single display view** (see; col. 8, lines (18-33) of Miller teaches a project management program that allows for the update and viewing of resource data).

**Referring to Claim 36**, see discussion of claim 23 above, while Miller teaches the computer readable medium above, Miller further discloses a computer readable medium having the limitations of:

**wherein task- related dependency data is represented as a series of incoming and outgoing dependency links, each incoming link originating from tasks allocated to a human resource on which a particular task depends, and each outgoing link being directed to a task depending on the particular task** (see; col. 13, lines (13-38) a project management program that allows for the linking of tasks to human resources these links created by dependencies between the task and resource).

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

- a. Visser et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0153991 A1) discloses compliance management system.
- b. Flaxer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0162741 A1) discloses a method and apparatus for product lifecycle management in a distributed environment enabled by dynamic business process composition and execution by rule inference.
- c. Battat et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2007/0033279 A1) discloses a method and apparatus for intuitively administering networked computer systems.
- d. Battat et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0033402 A1) discloses a method and apparatus for intuitively administering networked computer systems.
- e. Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,765,140) discloses a dynamic project management system.
- f. Haq et al. (U.S. Patent 6,275,812 B1) discloses an intelligent system for dynamic resource management.
- g. Rassman et al. (U.S. Patent 4,937,743 discloses a method and system for scheduling, monitoring and dynamically managing resources.
- h. Fields et al. (U.S. Patent 5,111,391 discloses a system and method for making staff schedules as a function of available resources as well as employee skill level, availability and priority.
- i. Abbruzzese et al. (U.S. Patent 5,557,515) discloses a computerized system and method for work management.
- j. Matsuzaki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,767,848) discloses a development support system.
- k. Hambrick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,836,011) discloses an implementation of teams and roles within a people oriented work environment.
- l. Aamodt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2007/0150389 A1) discloses a method and system for displaying an image instead of data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEPHEN SWARTZ whose telephone number is (571) 270-7789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/SSS/  
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623  
  
/JONATHAN G STERRETT/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623